



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/937,506	09/24/2001	Olli Salmela	413-010522-US(PAR)	2192

2512 7590 09/10/2002

PERMAN & GREEN
425 POST ROAD
FAIRFIELD, CT 06824

EXAMINER

LEE, BENNY T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2817

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

EXAMINER	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	3

DATE MAILED:

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

- ☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire Three (3) month(s), _____ days from the date of this letter.
Failing to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-648. |
| 3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449 | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152 |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474 | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-7 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1-3, 5, 6 are rejected.
5. ☒ Claims 4, 7 are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirements.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes until such time as allowable subject matter is indicated.
8. ☐ Allowable subject matter having been indicated, formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. These drawings are: ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation).
10. ☐ The ☐ proposed drawing correction and/or the ☐ proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____ has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner. ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved. ☐ disapproved (see explanation). However, the Patent and Trademark Office no longer makes drawing changes. It is now applicant's responsibility to ensure that the drawings are corrected. Corrections MUST be effected in accordance with the instructions set forth on the attached letter "INFORMATION ON HOW TO EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES", PTO-1474.
12. ☒ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received.
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 O.G. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other _____

SN 937506

Art Unit: 2817

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Note that respective subheadings should be provided to delineate the different sections of the specification. Page 1, line 9, note that "the employed frequencies" should be rephrased as -- frequency of operation --; line 10, note that "... of the cable structures to be used" should be rephrased for clarity; line 23, note that "the created structure" should be rephrased for clarity; line 35, note that --(see Fig. 1b) - - should follow "18" for clarity. Page 2, line 4, note that -- as shown in Fig. 1b -- should follow "degrees" for clarity; lines 25, 26, note that "O,2" and "O,6" should be respectively rewritten as - 0.2-- and --0.6--. Page 6, lines 14, 21, note that "cable 30" (l. 14) does not appear consistent with "plane 30" (l. 21), page 7, line 1, note that "them" should be rewritten to indicate the intended features; line 18, note that "minimised" should be rewritten as --minimized--. Note that reference label "61" appearing in Fig. 6 needs to be described in the specification.

Appropriate correction is required.

The drawings are objected to because of the following: In Figs. ~~1a, 1b~~, note that these figures need to be labeled as -- ~~PRIOR ART~~ --; In fig. 1b, should reference label "14" correctly be --15-- such as to be commensurate with the description of "power lines 15" in the specification?; In all drawing figures, note that proper cross-hatching for all dielectric materials should be provided. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Art Unit: 2817

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the coplanar cable of claim 7 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The following claims have been found objectionable for reasons set forth below:

In claim 1, note that "realised" should be rewritten as ~~--provided--~~; note that 'means of' should be deleted as being unnecessary; note that "formed" should be rewritten as --disposed --.

In claim 5, note that "formed" should be rewritten as --defined -- for a better characterization.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by the published EP ('831) application (cited by applicant).

Art Unit: 2817

Note that figs. 4A, 4B disclose an inverted micro strip arrangement having a cavity (513) defined by opposing surfaces upon which the signal conductor (505c) is disposed on a raised rectangular support (508) relative to the surface of the cavity.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the published EP ('831) application (cited by applicant).

While the raised support has a "rectangular" shape, obviously alternative yet equivalent shapes (e.g. square, being a special case or "rectangular" would have been suggested.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the published EP ('831) application in view of the Japanese patent¹ abstract ('814), both cited by applicant.

Similarly, other alternative yet equivalent raised shapes would have been usable. For example, a raised portion having curved portions such as taught by the Japanese abstract would have been an art recognized equivalent.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Takahashi et al is the U.S. patent equivalent to the above applied EP publication..

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Benny Lee at telephone number (703) 308-4902.

Benny Lee
BENNY LEE
Patent Attorney
ARL JUNE 2017